



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

54
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,044	12/27/2001	Hiroyasu Kurashina	81752.0119	9163
26021	7590	07/13/2005	EXAMINER	
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P. 500 S. GRAND AVENUE SUITE 1900 LOS ANGELES, CA 90071-2611				ROHWER, JACOB P
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2624		

DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/035,044	KURASHINA, HIROYASU
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jacob P. Rohwer	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date Sept 14 2004.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: in Figure 3 Letter P and Reference Number 122, in Figure 4 Reference Number 306, in Figure 6 Reference D17, and in Figure 10 Reference D49. Furthermore, in Figure 3 #14 should be changed to #4 and #15 should be changed to #14 in order to correspond to the specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Pg. 17 Reference Number 4 refers to a tape cartridge, not to the display the Reference Number 4 refers to in the remainder of the specification. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to

avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Furthermore, there are some proposed corrections to drawings that fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) regarding references used in the specification. On Pg. 23 Reference Number 303 is used in order to refer to, "...a nought key 303 for being depressed when the student judges that an answer to the question is correct,.." and "...a cross key 303 for being depressed when the student judges that an answer to a question is wrong,..." The second Reference Number 303 should be changed to 304 in order to correspond to the drawing in Figure 15. Additionally, on Pg. 30 the specification says in regard to Figure 7 "...so that the screen is switched to a screen (D24) displaying Question circled 3 to be entered next." Once again, the Reference (D24) should be changed to Reference (D25) in order to correspond with Figure 7. Once again, corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as

either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Printing apparatus and Printing Method of Labels and Flashcards.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 5,494,444 to Thayer et al.

Regarding claim 1, Thayer teaches a printing apparatus comprising:

reading means for reading out stored data (Fig 5 Reference # 102, Col 6-7 Lin 66-67 and 1-4 respectively, the figure shows that if the program is launched by file selection, the PC reads data into memory in order to be displayed on the monitor) including question data and answer data corresponding thereto which are stored in manner correlated with each other; (Col 2 Lin 61-64)

and

printing means (Fig 1 Reference #24) for printing the question data and the answer data on a print medium, based on the stored data read out by said reading means, in a predetermined format enabling visual recognition relevancy between the question data and the answer data. (Fig. 2, Col 4 Lin 64-66)

Regarding claim 2, which depends from claim 1, Thayer teaches

A printing apparatus according to claim 1, further including print data-forming means for forming print data composed of least one item of question data and at least one item of the answer data corresponding thereto, respectively, based on the stored data read out by said reading means, (Col 2 Lin 46-57, Note that the mentioned display is operably associated with a computer connected to a printer through a cable as seen in Fig 1 Reference #10, #24, and #26) and

wherein said printing means includes means for printing the question data and the answer data based on the print data formed by said print data-forming means. (Col 4 Lin 14-19)

Regarding claim 3, which depends from claim 2, Thayer teaches

A printing apparatus according to claim 2, wherein said print data-forming means includes means for forming the print data based on designated question data which is arbitrarily selected from the at least one item of the question data and answer data corresponding to the designated question data. (Col 15 Lin 43-53, Note that once displayed, the user has the capability to print the information displayed by using "print" command in the "file" drop down menu of Fig 16, Col 7 Lin 54-57)

Regarding claim 4, which depends from claim 2, Thayer teaches

A printing apparatus according to claim 2, wherein said print data-forming means includes means for forming the print data based on extracted question data which is extracted from the at least one item of the question data (Fig 2 Reference #34) according to a predetermined rule, and answer data (Fig 2 Reference #36) corresponding to the designated question data. (Fig 20 Reference #168, Col 2 Lin 64-66, Note the creation of flashcards in Thayer allows for the user to select the criteria for which question data is displayed, referred to in the art as different "sets".)

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 1, Thayer teaches

A printing apparatus according to claim 1 including display means for displaying the question data and the answer data, in a state in which the relevancy between the question data and the answer data corresponding thereto can be visually recognized. (Col 2 Lin 33-34, Fig 2, Question Data Reference #34 and Answer Data Reference #36 on the Display)

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 6, Thayer teaches

A printing apparatus according to claim 6, wherein said display means includes means for displaying the question data (Fig 2 Reference #34) and the answer data (Fig 2 Reference #36) in at least one of a state in which the question data and the answer data are displayed separately and a state in which the question data and the answer data are displayed simultaneously. (See Fig. 19, the "show" drop down menu refers to which data is displayed as shown in Fig. 2-4, the cue side, the response side, or both sides simultaneously)

Regarding claim 10, which depends from claim 1, Thayer teaches

A printing apparatus according claim 1, further including input means capable of inputting at least one the question data and the answer data. (Fig 1 Reference 16, Col 5 Lin 5-12)

Regarding claim 11, which depends from claim 1, Thayer teaches

A printing apparatus according to claim 1, further including storage means (Fig 5 Reference #102, files are loaded from memory) for storing the stored data, and wherein said reading means includes means for reading out the stored data stored in said storage means. (Fig 5 Reference #102, Col 7 Lin 1-7, Once again the PC loads the data into memory in order to be displayed)

Regarding claim 13, which depends from claim 1, Thayer discloses a printing apparatus according to claim 1, further including storage medium-mounting means for mounting a storage medium storing the stored data, and

wherein said reading means includes means for reading out the stored data stored in the external storage device via said external storage device-connecting means. (Fig 1 Reference #10)

In regard to the reference specified, it can be seen that a disc drive is located in the upper left hand portion of the CPU. It is inherent that this disc drive is therefore storage medium-mounting means for the discs used to store data.

Regarding claim 21, the apparatus of claim 1 performs the method of claim 21.

Please see rational provided in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 22, which depends from claim 21, please see rational provided in the rejection of claim 2. In addition, the apparatus of claim 2 performs the method of claim 21.

Regarding claim 23, which depends from claim 22, please see rational provided in the rejection of claim 3. In addition, the apparatus of claim 3 performs the method of claim 23.

Regarding claim 24, which depends from claim 22, please see rational provided in the rejection of claim 4. In addition, the apparatus of claim 4 performs the method of claim 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 5,494,444 to Thayer et al in view of US Patent No 6,470,171 to Helmick et al.

Regarding Claim 5, which depends from claim 2, Thayer discloses:

A printing apparatus according to claim 2,

Thayer does not expressly disclose a printing apparatus according to claim 2, wherein said print data-forming means includes means for forming the print data by

replacing part or all of at least one of the question data and the answer data corresponding to the question data by blank data.

However, Helmick discloses print data-forming means that includes means for forming the print data by replacing part or all of at least one of the question data and the answer data corresponding to the question data with a fill in the blank section. (Col 21 Lin 50-55)

It is inherent that in order to format fill in the blank questions for display, the blanks corresponding to hidden or invisible data, must replace the original question or answer data that is the object of learning for the user, so that a question and answer format can be achieved using fill in the blanks.

The Thayer and Helmick Patents are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor relating to displaying question and answer data in order to allow a user to learn.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the format of fill in the blank questions in the Helmick Patent as a question to be displayed and printed in the Thayer Patent.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide an alternate way of learning that allows the user to make connections regarding the answer to a question based on the key words associated or related to the topic, as in usual fill in the blank questions.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Helmick Patent with the Thayer Patent to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Regarding claim 25, which depends from claim 22, please see rational provided in the rejection of claim 5. In addition, the apparatus of claim 5 performs the method of claim 25.

Claims 8, 9, 14, 15-16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 5,494,444 to Thayer et al in view of US Patent No 6,325,630 to Grabmayr.

Regarding claim 8, which depends from claim 1, Thayer discloses the printing apparatus according to claim 1.

Thayer does not expressly disclose a printing apparatus according to claim 1, further including cutting means for cutting the print medium to a desired length, and wherein said cutting means includes means for cutting the print medium such that a question portion on which printing is carried out based on the question data and an answer portion on which printing is carried out based on answer data corresponding to the question data come apart.

However, Grabmayr discloses a printing apparatus, further including cutting means for cutting the print medium to a desired length (Col 6 Lin 19-21, The labels, Reference #7 in Fig 2 are cut to a desired length that is uniform throughout the label sheets used in the invention), and

wherein said cutting means includes means for cutting the print medium such that a question portion on which printing is carried out based on the question data and an answer portion on which printing is carried out based on answer data (Fig 1 Reference #9, the answer data is the word that is to be learned by the user, so it is

Art Unit: 2624

printed on the removable labels) corresponding to the question data (Fig 1 Reference #11, the question data is the term in the native tongue) come apart. (Fig 1 and 2, Col 5 Lin 50-62)

The limitation for cutting the print medium to a desired length is disclosed in the Grabmayr Patent as the label carrier sheet whose layout is determined previous to printing, and in that regard, although not mentioned, it is known that the desired length of the labels to be printed, or in essence, the specific layout of the label carrier sheet can be altered according to certain data. (Fig 2 Reference #7, Col 4 Lin 20-27)

Furthermore, referring to the cutting means reference in Col 6 Lin 15-21, if a label is made or cut from conventional label stock material and the label sheet can be die cut in the form of a desired label, then it is obvious that a cutting means must be used to produce the label the cutting lines on the label sheet.

The Thayer and Grabmayr Patents are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor relating to printing question and answer.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the idea of cutting the print medium in order to separate corresponding question and answer data as specified in the Grabmayr Patent in the printing apparatus of the Thayer Patent.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to separate corresponding question and answer data in order to facilitate learning based on visualizations. (Grabmayr, Col 1 Lin 18-23)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Grabmayr Patent with the Thayer Patent to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 9, which depends from claim 1, Thayer discloses the printing apparatus according to claim 1.

Thayer does not expressly disclose a printing apparatus according to claim 1, further including cutting means for cutting the print medium to a desired length, and wherein said cutting means includes means for cutting the print medium such that a question portion on which printing is carried out based on the question data and an answer portion on which printing is carried out based on answer data corresponding to the question data are in a state remaining connected to each other.

However, Grabmayr discloses a printing apparatus, further including cutting means (Col 6 Lin 15-19, See comment in claim 8 regarding cutting means) for cutting the print medium to a desired length (See comment in claim 8 regarding desired length limitation), and

wherein said cutting means includes means for cutting the print medium such that a question portion on which printing is carried out based on the question data and an answer portion on which printing is carried out based on answer data corresponding to the question data are in a state remaining connected to each other. (Fig 1 and 2, Col 5 Lin 50-62)

The limitation that the question and answer data remain in a state connected to each other is disclosed by the Grabmayr Patent with respect to the fact that the labels are printed on the same page and same row (Fig 1 Reference #7 and #11, Col 4 Lin 14-

20) to their corresponding data, connected by the label carrier sheet (Fig 3 Reference #5).

The Thayer and Grabmayr Patents are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor relating to printing question and answer data on an adhesive print medium.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the idea of cutting the print medium in order to maintain the connection of corresponding question and answer data as specified in the Grabmayr Patent in the printing apparatus of the Thayer Patent.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to maintain the connection and organization of corresponding question and answer data in order to store and reuse the labels that facilitate learning based on visualizations in such means as a vocabulary notebook. (Fig 3 Reference #5, Col 2 Lin 28-30)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Grabmayr Patent with the Thayer Patent to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Regarding claim 14, which depends from claim 1, Thayer discloses the printing apparatus according to claim 1.

Thayer does not expressly disclose a printing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said print medium comprises an image-receiving layer serving as a printing surface, an adhesive layer formed on a reverse side of the image-receiving layer, and a peel layer formed on a side of the adhesive layer opposite to the image-receiving layer,

said print medium being affixable to an object article by peeling the image-receiving layer and the adhesive layer from the peel layer.

However, Grabmayr discloses a printing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said print medium comprises an image-receiving layer serving as a printing surface, an adhesive layer (Col 6 Lin 18-19, Fig 4-6 Reference #17) formed on a reverse side of the image-receiving layer(Col 6 Lin 18, Fig 4-6 Reference #7' referred to as "label material") and a peel layer (Col 6 Lin 17, referred to as "base sheet" or "liner") formed on a side of the adhesive layer opposite to the image-receiving layer, said print medium being affixable to an object article by peeling the image-receiving layer and the adhesive layer from the peel layer.(Col 6 Lin 19-21)

The Thayer and Grabmayr Patents are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor relating to printing question and answer data on an adhesive print medium.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the individual adhesive labels specified in the Grabmayr Patent in the printing apparatus of the Thayer Patent.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow the use of visualization in the learning process, such as attaching foreign words to their meaningful object, thus creating a very effective learning tool for the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Grabmayr Patent with the Thayer Patent to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 1, Thayer discloses the printing apparatus according to claim 1.

Thayer does not expressly disclose that the print medium is a tape-shaped member.

However, Grabmayr discloses that the print medium is a tape-shaped member. (Fig 1 and 2 Reference #3 and #7, Col 4 Lin 23)

Note that a tape-shaped member could be anything in the form of a rectangle. Most print-mediums relate to a tape-shaped member, such as the page of labels to be printed on (Reference #3) or the individual labels. (Reference #7)

The Thayer and Grabmayr Patents are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor relating to printing question and answer data on a print medium.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the rectangular form of the printing medium specified in the Grabmayr Patent in the printing apparatus of the Thayer Patent.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow for easier organization of the labels printed.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Grabmayr Patent with the Thayer Patent to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

Regarding claim 16, which depends from claim 1, Thayer discloses:

a printing apparatus according to claim 1,

Thayer does not expressly disclose a printing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the stored data includes question data and answer data having relevancy

between a word of a foreign language and a corresponding word of a user's mother tongue.

However, Grabmayr discloses an apparatus wherein the stored data includes question data and answer data having relevancy between a word of a foreign language and a corresponding word of a user's mother tongue. (Fig 1, Col 4, Lin 14-20)

The Thayer and Grabmayr Patents are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor relating to printing question and answer data in order to allow a user to learn.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the subject of foreign language translation in the Grabmayr Patent as a basis for the question and answer data displayed and printed in the Thayer Patent.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow for studying and printing flashcards that correspond to a foreign language a student is learning.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Grabmayr Patent with the Thayer Patent to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Regarding claim 20, which depends from claim 1, please see the rational provided in the rejection of claim 16. In this case the question data subject matter is not a foreign language but the learning is carried out through image or pattern. (Grabmayr, Col 10 Lin 23-29)

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 5,494,444 to Thayer et al in view of US Patent Application No 2001/0040688A1 to Harada.

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 1, Thayer discloses a printing apparatus according to claim 1.

Thayer does not expressly disclose a printing apparatus according to claim 1, further including external storage device-connecting means for connecting an external storage device storing the stored data to the printing apparatus, and

wherein said reading means includes means for reading out the stored data stored in the external storage device via said external storage device-connecting means.

However, Harada discloses an external storage device-connecting means for connecting an external storage device (Fig 4 Reference #406) storing the stored data to the printing apparatus, and

wherein said reading means includes means for reading out the stored data stored in the external storage device via said external storage device-connecting means. (Fig 4, Note that there is a main bus that serves as the external storage device-connecting means by two way connecting the External Storage #406, the CPU #401, and the Printer Engine #108, Pg 4 Paragraph [0066])

The Thayer Patent and Harada Patent Publication are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor relating to printing stored data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the external data storage device specified in the Harada Patent Publication to the printing apparatus of the Thayer Patent.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to add more memory in order to allow for more question and answer data to be stored in addition to the stored data in the printing apparatus, which eventually allows more question and answer data to be printed in order to make flashcards as a learning device.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Harada Patent Publication with the Thayer Patent to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 5,494,444 to Thayer et al in view of US Patent No 5,888,071 to Takamori.

Regarding claim 17, which depends from claim 1, Thayer discloses:

a printing apparatus according to claim 1,

Thayer does not expressly disclose a printing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the stored data includes question data and answer data having relevancy between a word of a language and phonetic symbols corresponding thereto.

However, Takamori discloses an apparatus wherein the stored data includes question data and answer data having relevancy between a word of a language and phonetic symbols corresponding thereto. (Fig 18, Col 7 Lin 40-43)

The Thayer and Takamori Patents are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor relating to displaying question and answer data in order to allow a user to learn.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the phonetic sounds of language as specified in the Takamori

Patent as a basis for the question and answer data displayed and printed in the Thayer Patent.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to allow for studying and printing flashcards that correspond to pronouncing words that are difficult to speak.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the Takamori with the Thayer Patent to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Regarding claim 18, which depends from claim 1, Thayer does not specifically disclose:

A printing apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the stored data includes question data and answer data having relevancy between a name of a provision of a law and contents of the provision.

However, it is officially noted that it was known to a person skilled in the art that the learning apparatus of the Takamori patent discloses a teaching process that includes a variety of subjects provided for the student to study. (Col 4 Lin 2-5)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include the subject of law provisions and contents in the learning apparatus specified in the combination of Thayer and Takamori.

The motivation for doing so would be to include all possible subjects that a student encounters in the course of an education as a basis for the tools of studying that subject matter.

Regarding claim 19, which depends from claim 1, please see the rational provided in the rejection of claim 17. In this case the question data subject matter is not

related to the phonetics of language but to an event in history and the date of that event.
(Takamori, Col 4 Lin 2-5)

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US Patent Number 5,842,869 to McGregor et al discloses a question and answer interacting display device. US Patent Number 6,238,036 to Otsuka refers to printing a tape-shaped adhesive print medium. US Patent Number 6,023,342 to Yanagida refers to scanning and printing question and answer data.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob P. Rohwer whose telephone number is 571-272-5509. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jacob P. Rohwer
DAVID MOORE
TECHNOLOGY 2600
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY 2600
DAVID MOORE